REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-73 are pending. Claim 73 has been added by the present amendment. No other amendments have been made. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. No new subject matter is being added by this response.

I. Claims Not Rejected

Contrary to indications in the Office Action Summary, the Office Action did not reject claims 10, 24, and 39. It is therefore assumed that these claims are allowed. If these claims are not allowed, Applicant respectfully requests a detailed rejection of these claims in a new Non-Final Office Action.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 17, 29, 37, 41, 46, and 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,905,461 issued May 18, 1999 to Neher ("Neher"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 17, 29, 41, and 46

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 1, 17, 29, 41, and 46 in paragraph 3 of the Office Action.

Claim 1 recites a device with a processor "operating one or more algorithms for comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and a comparison radio frequency identifier selected from the stored radio frequency identifiers in the database and for generating a display signal based on the comparison; and wherein the database of stored radio frequency identifiers is accessed as a function of a radio frequency signal and a position signal indicative of a location of the device."

Neher discloses a global positioning satellite tracking system that includes a tracking unit (or "device," as cited by the Examiner) 18 worn, for example, by a child. (Neher, Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 15-22). The tracking unit 18 includes a transmitter that transmits an identification signal and a location signal to a relay station 16. (Neher, col. 5, lines 24-27). The relay station 16 determines whether the identification and location signals from the tracking unit 18 are valid,

and if so, forwards the signals to a central monitoring station 12 to keep track of the position of the tracking unit 18. (Neher, col. 5, lines 26-45).

In contrast to the device of claim 1, the tracking unit 18 of Neher is merely a bracelet that transmits identification and location signals. The tracking unit 18 does not contain a processor or a database. The relay station 16 of Neher includes a processor that compares the identification signal received from the tracking unit 18 to comparison identification signals in a database and confirms the validity of the location signal. Even if one considers the relay station 16 as a "device," claim 1 additionally recites that the processor generates "a display signal based on the comparison." Neither the tracking unit 18 nor the relay station 16 have a processor that generates a display based on the comparison between the received radio frequency identifier and a comparison radio frequency identifier stored in the database.

Accordingly because Neher fails to disclose every element of claim 1, it does not anticipate claim 1 and claim 1 is allowable over Neher.

Claim 17 depends on claim 10, and claims 41 and 46 depend on claim 39. As noted above, claim 10 and 39 are not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection of claims 17, 41, and 46 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 29 depends on claim 25. Claim 25 is not rejected as being anticipated by Neher. As discussed below, claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. As such, the rejection of claim 29 as being anticipated by Neher is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 69

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 3 and 69 in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

Claim 3 depends on claim 1. For the reasons described above that claim 1 is not anticipated by Neher, claim 3 is not anticipated by Neher.

Claim 69 depends on claim 66. Claim 66 is not rejected as being anticipated by Neher. As discussed below, claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. As such, the rejection of claim 69 as being anticipated by Neher is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 37

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 4 and 37 in paragraph 5 of the Office Action.

Claim 4 depends on claim 1. For the reasons described above that claim 1 is not anticipated by Neher, claim 4 is not anticipated by Neher.

Claim 37 depends on claim 31. Claim 31 is not rejected as being anticipated by Neher. As discussed below, claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. As such, the rejection of claim 37 as being anticipated by Neher is improper and should be withdrawn.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 6-9, 11-13, 15, 16, 18, 20-23, 26-28, 30, 33, 36, 40, 42, 44, 45, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Neher in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,012,534 issued Mar. 14, 2006 to Chaco ("Chaco"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Chaco discloses an infant monitoring system that includes a transmission module (TM). The TM receives RFID transmissions from badges that can be attached to an infant and various caregivers (e.g., nurse, mom, dad, domestic partner). The TM receives the RFID signal from the badges and then determines if the ID is associated with an authorized user to make sure a caregiver is in range. (Chaco, col. 7, lines 25-38).

Claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 22, 23, 30, and 42

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 22, 23, 30, and 42 in paragraph 7 of the Office Action.

Claim 6 recites "wherein the display signal is one of a signal indicative of a correspondence and a divergence between the decoded radio frequency identifier and the comparison radio frequency identifier." The Examiner acknowledges that Neher fails to disclose this element. Instead, the Examiner asserts that Chaco discloses the claimed element and that it would be obvious to incorporate a signal indicative of correspondence and divergence of the decoded and comparison frequency identifiers "as a way of informing one of a change in position of the device." Reconsideration of the combination is respectfully requested. The tracking unit 18 of Neher already transmits a GPS location signal to the relay station 16. As such, there would be no reason for the system of Neher to be modified to inform "one of a change in position of the device," as suggested by the Examiner. Further, the relay station 16 of Neher is a stationary building and antenna, and therefore, would never change position. As such, if the relay station 16 is considered the "device," there would be no reason to inform "one of a change in position of the device," as proposed by the Examiner, and thus, there is no motivation

for the proposed combination. It is respectfully submitted that the combination is improper and any rejection based thereon should be withdrawn.

Claim 7 depends on claim 1. As described above in the discussion of claim 1, Neher fails to disclose a device with a processor coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and a comparison radio frequency identifier selected from the stored radio frequency identifiers in the database and for generating a display signal based on the comparison. Further, Chaco also fails to disclose a device a processor coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and a comparison radio frequency identifier selected from the stored radio frequency identifiers in the database and for generating a display signal based on the comparison. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above that claim 1 is not anticipated by Neher, claim 7 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco. Moreover, claim 7 recites a display structured to display the radio frequency information in response to the display signal. However, neither Neher nor Chaco discloses a display structured to display the radio frequency information in response to the display signal, and additionally, the Office Action fails to explain how the cited references teach this element. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not, in fact, teach this element.

Claim 8 depends on claim 1. As described above in the discussion of claim 1, Neher fails to disclose a device with a processor coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and a comparison radio frequency identifier selected from the stored radio frequency identifiers in the database and for generating a display signal based on the comparison. Further, Chaco also fails to disclose these elements. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above that claim 1 is not anticipated by Neher, claim 8 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco. Moreover, claim 8 recites a display structured to display the radio frequency information in response to the display signal indicative of a correspondence between the decoded radio frequency identifier and the comparison radio frequency identifier. However, neither Neher nor Chaco discloses a display structured to display the radio frequency information in response to the display signal indicative of a correspondence between the decoded radio frequency identifier and the comparison radio frequency identifier, and additionally, the Office Action fails to explain how the cited references teach this element.

Claim 9 depends on claim 1. As described above in the discussion of claim 1, Neher fails to disclose a device with a processor coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and a comparison radio frequency identifier selected from the stored radio frequency identifiers in the database and for generating a display signal based on the comparison. Further, Chaco also fails to disclose these elements. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above that claim 1 is not anticipated by Neher, claim 9 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco.

Claim 13 depends on claim 10. As noted above, claim 10 is not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 22 and 23 depend on claim 19, and claim 30 depends on claim 25. In the rejection of claims 19 and 25 discussed below, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 19 and 25 distinguish over the combination of Neher and Chaco. As such, the rejection of claims 22, 23, and 30 based on the combination of Neher and Chaco is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 42 depends on claim 39. As noted above, claim 39 is not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 20, 21, and 40

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 11, 12, 20, 21, and 40 in paragraph 8 of the Office Action.

Claims 11 and 12 depend on claim 10. As noted above, claim 10 is not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection of claims 11 and 12 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 20 and 21 depend on claim 19. In the rejection of claim 19 discussed below, the Examiner acknowledges that claim 19 distinguishes over the combination of Neher and Chaco. As such, the rejection of claims 20 and 21 based on the combination of Neher and Chaco is improper and should be withdrawn. Moreover, the Examiner particularly fails to explain how Neher and/or Chaco disclose the specific elements of claims 20 and 21.

Claim 40 depends on claim 39. As noted above, claim 39 is not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection of claim 40 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 26, 27, 33, and 44

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 15, 26, 27, 33, and 44 in paragraph 9 of the Office Action.

Claim 15 depends on claim 10. As noted above, claim 10 is not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection of claim 15 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 26 and 27 depend on claim 25, and claim 33 depends on claim 31. In the rejection of claims 25 and 31 discussed below, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 25 and 31 distinguish over the combination of Neher and Chaco. As such, the rejection of claims 26, 27, and 33 based on the combination of Neher and Chaco is improper and should be withdrawn. Moreover, the Examiner particularly fails to explain how Neher and/or Chaco disclose the specific elements of claims 26, 27, and 33.

Claim 44 depends on claim 39. As noted above, claim 39 is not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection of claim 44 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 45

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 16 and 45 in paragraph 10 of the Office Action.

Claim 16 depends on claim 10, and claim 45 depends on claim 39. As noted above, claims 10 and 39 are not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection of claims 16 and 45 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 18 and 47

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 18 and 47 in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Claim 18 depends on claim 10, and claim 47 depends on claim 39. As noted above, claims 10 and 39 are not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection of claims 18 and 47 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 28 and 36

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 28 and 36 in paragraph 12 of the Office Action.

Claim 28 depends on claim 25, and claim 36 depends on claim 31. In the rejection of claims 25 and 31 discussed below, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 25 and 31 distinguish over the combination of Neher and Chaco. As such, the rejection of claims 28 and 36 based on the combination of Neher and Chaco is improper and should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 5, 14, 19, 25, 31, 32, 34, 35, 43, 48-68, and 70-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,790,943 issued Feb. 5, 1974 to Pickles et al ("Pickles"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Pickles discloses a radio frequency antenna system that transmits navigation information to aircraft. As noted by the Examiner, the antenna system in Pickles can transmit a Morse code identification message. (Pickles, col. 5, line 22-29).

The claims rejected in this rejection each have a recitation related to a transmission or receipt of a transmission in Morse code. For example, claim 5 recites "wherein the coded radio frequency identifier is coded in Morse." The Examiner acknowledges that neither Neher nor Chaco teaches a device that transmits in Morse. Instead, the Examiner asserts that it would be obvious to incorporate the Morse code transmissions of Pickles into the combined device of Neher and Chaco because Morse code transmissions are "faster." Under the scenario suggested by the Examiner, the device 18 of Neher would have to convert the outgoing signals to Morse code and then transmit the signals to the relay station 16. The relay station 16 would have to decode the signals from Morse code. The additional coding and decoding steps would necessarily result in slower transmissions. The Examiner provides no support that such a transmission would be faster. Alternatively, the combination proposed by the Examiner would result in a child inputting his location into device 18 of Neher in Morse code instead of utilizing the GPS location signal. It is respectfully submitted that this would not, in fact, be faster, nor feasible. As such, there is no motivation for combining Pickles with Neher and Chaco and any rejection based thereon should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 14, 38, and 43

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 5, 14, 38, and 43 in paragraph 14 of the Office Action.

Claim 5 depends on claim 1, and claim 38 depends on claim 31. As described above in the discussion of claim 1, Neher fails to disclose a device with a processor coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for comparing a decoded radio frequency identifier and a comparison radio frequency identifier selected from the stored radio frequency identifiers in the database and for generating a display signal based on the comparison. Further, Chaco also fails to disclose these elements. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above that claim 1 is not anticipated by Neher, claim 5 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles. For the reasons discussed below that claim 31 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles, claim 38 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles.

Claim 14 depends on claim 10, and claim 43 depends on claim 39. As noted above, claims 10 and 39 are not rejected in the Office Action. As such, the rejection of claims 14 and 43 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 31, 32, 48-50, 59, and 66

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 19, 31, 32, 48-50, 59, and 66 in paragraph 15 of the Office Action.

As noted above, the rejection of independent claims 19, 31, 48, 59, and 66 should be withdrawn at least because the combination of Neher and Chaco and the combination of Neher, Chaco, and Pickles are improper. In any event, as discussed below, these independent claims recite elements not disclosed by any combination of the cited references.

Independent claim 19 recites a display device comprising a "display structured to display one of the radio frequency information and caution information in response to a signal received on a third input." Claim 19 further recites the display device includes a memory that receives radio frequency control and position signals and correlates the signals with a database of radio frequency identifiers. Claim 19 also recites that the display device includes a processor operating algorithms for decoding the radio frequency identifiers, comparing the decoded identifier with the selected radio frequency identifiers, and generating a signal based on the comparison to the display. Even in combination, the cited references fail to disclose these elements, and thus, claim 19 not rendered obvious.

Independent claim 31 recites elements such as "receiving a decoded coded signal from a radio navigation station; correlating the decoded signal to a known radio navigation station; retrieving information corresponding to the known radio navigation station from a database of stored information; and making the retrieved information available on an output from the database." The Examiner fails to explain how any combination of references discloses these elements. It is noted that the system of Pickles does not "receive" a signal from a radio navigation system.

Independent claim 48 recites a down-sampler quadrature filter bank, a pair of down-sampler/multi-stage modulated filter banks, a confidence presence detector, a viterbi most-likely sequence estimator, and a Morse symbol decoder. Pickles is cited for disclosing a Morse code signal, but Pickles does not even remotely suggest these elements. The Examiner similarly fails to explain how any the other cited references disclose the elements of claim 48.

Claims 49 and 50 depend on claim 48. For the reasons discussed above that claim 48 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles, claims 49 and 50 are not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles.

Independent claim 59 recites a means for converting a detected Morse radio frequency signal, a means for filtering the respective in-phase and quadrature signals, a means for searching across the plurality of filter components to predict which of the filter banks contains an identification string of a detected radio signal, and a means for operating a most-likely sequence estimator on outputs of the searching means. Claim 66 recites similar elements in a method claim. Pickles is cited for disclosing a Morse code signal, but Pickles does not even remotely suggest these elements. The Examiner also fails to explain how the other cited references disclose any of the elements of claims 59 and 66.

Claim 25, 52, and 62

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 25, 52, and 62 in paragraph 16 of the Office Action.

Independent claim 25 recites "locating in an onboard database database information corresponding to a facility closest to a present position of an aircraft using the indicated radio frequency." As noted above, Neher and Chaco are related to systems for monitoring children. Pickles is a navigation antenna that is mounted on the ground. (Pickles, col. 4, lines 23). Pickles does not disclose or suggest an onboard database with database information for determining the closest facility. As such, claim 25 distinguishes over any combination of the cited references.

Claim 52 depends on claim 48. For the reasons discussed above that claim 48 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles, claim 52 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles. Moreover, the Examiner fails to explain how any of the cited references disclose or suggest the recited elements.

Claim 62 depends on claim 59. For the reasons discussed above that claim 59 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles, claim 62 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles. Moreover, the Examiner fails to explain how any of the cited references disclose or suggest the recited elements.

Claims 34 and 35

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 34 and 35 in paragraph 17 of the Office Action.

Claims 34 and 35 depend on claim 31. For the reasons discussed above that claim 31 is not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles, claims 34 and 35 are not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles. Moreover, contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, Pickles does not disclose the recited elements of claims 34 and/or 35.

Claims 51, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 67, 68, and 69

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 51, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 67, 68, and 69 in paragraph 18 of the Office Action.

Claims 51, 56, 57, and 58 depend on claim 48. Claims 60 and 61 depend on claim 59. Claims 67, 68, and 69 depend on claim 66. For the reasons discussed above that claims 48, 59, and 66 are not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles, claims 51, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 67, 68, and 69 are not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles.

Furthermore, claims 51, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 67, 68, and 69 each recite features that further define different aspects of the invention related to Morse code. For example, claim 51 recites "a correlator circuit receiving an output of the Morse symbol decoder and a predicted Morse code radio frequency identifier, the correlator circuit structured to correlate the output of the Morse symbol decoder with the predicted Morse code radio frequency identifier to determine whether the detected VHF radio frequency signal identifier corresponds to the predicted identifier." The Examiner rejects all nine of these claims based on seven lines of Pickles that almost offhandedly refers to a "Morse code identification message." Pickles does not, in fact, even remotely disclose or suggest the particular elements recited in claims 51, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 67, 68, and 69, nor does the Examiner identify how these particular elements are disclosed. Additionally, neither Neher nor Chaco discloses or suggests these elements.

Claims 53, 54, 55, 63, 64, 65, 70, 71, and 72

The Examiner specifically rejects claims 53, 54, 55, 63, 64, 65, 70, 71, and 72 in paragraph 19 of the Office Action.

Claims 53-55 depend on claim 48. Claims 63-65 depend on claim 59. Claims 70-72 depend on claim 66. For the reasons discussed above that claims 48, 59, and 66 are not rendered

obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles, claims 53-55, 63-65, and 70-72 are not rendered obvious by Neher in view of Chaco and further in view of Pickles.

Furthermore, claims 53, 54, 55, 63, 64, 65, 70, 71, and 72 each recite features that further define different aspects of the invention related to Morse code. For example, claim 53 recites "a threshold estimator circuit coupled to receive the predicted Morse code radio frequency identifier and structured to estimate a signal energy in the predicted Morse code radio frequency identifier." The Examiner rejects all nine of these claims based on seven lines of Pickles that almost offhandedly refers to a "Morse code identification message." Pickles does not, in fact, even remotely disclose or suggest the particular elements recited in claims 53, 54, 55, 63, 64, 65, 70, 71, and 72, nor does the Examiner identify how these particular elements are disclosed. Additionally, neither Neher nor Chaco discloses or suggests these elements.

IV. New Claim

New claim 73 has been added. Support for the new claim can be found, for example, in paragraph [0002] of the originally filed application. No combination of the cited references discloses or suggests the element of claim 73.

V. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if it would in any way advance prosecution of this case.

While no other fees are believed due, the applicant hereby requests that any other required fee to maintain pendency of this case be charged to Deposit Account 50-2091.

Respectfully submitted,
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 12/20/06

By Chad C. Anderson
Chad C. Anderson
Reg. No. 44,505
(480) 385-5060

Customer No. 000128

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☑ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.
As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.